

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed the Application in light of the Office Action mailed October 17, 2006. At the time of the Office Action, Claims 1-47 were pending in the Application. The Examiner rejects Claims 1-33 and allows Claims 34-47. Applicants amend Claims 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, 11-13, 15, 17, 20, 22-24, 26, 28, 31, and 33, without prejudice or disclaimer, and add new Claim 48. Applicants' amendments and additions have been done to advance prosecution in this case and not to overcome the cited references. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims and favorable action in this case.

Section 103 Rejection

The Examiner rejects Claims 1-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0248583 A1 issued to Satt et al. (hereinafter “*Satt*”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,611,547 issued to Rauhala (hereinafter “*Rauhala*”). “To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” M.P.E.P. §706.02(j) (citing *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 U.S.P.Q. 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985)). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner does not present either to support the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Applicants respectfully submit that *Satt* and *Rauhala*, alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest each limitation recited in Applicants' claims. The Examiner states that *Satt* “does not explicitly show holding post-sector-change packets for the mobile device until pre-sector-change packets have been emptied from the class of service queues.” *Office Action*, p. 3. The Examiner instead relies on *Rauhala*. *Office Action*, p. 3. Applicants respectfully submit that *Rauhala* does not disclose, teach, or suggest “holding post-sector-change packets for the mobile device temporarily in a buffer until pre-sector-change packets have been emptied from the class of service queues” as recited in amended Claim 1. Therefore, *Satt* and *Rauhala*, alone and in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest at

least this limitation. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claim 1 and its dependents.

Independent Claims 12 and 23 each recite certain limitations that, for reasons substantially similar to those discussed with reference to independent Claim 1, *Satt* and *Rauhala*, alone and in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 12 and 23 together with their dependents.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's allowance of Claims 34-47. *Office Action*, p. 7. The Examiner provides a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. *Office Action*, p. 7. Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.104, Applicants respectfully issue a statement commenting on the Examiner's reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's reasons for allowance to the extent that they are inconsistent with applicable case law, statutes, and regulations. Furthermore, Applicants do not admit to any characterization or limitation of the claims, particularly any that are inconsistent with the language of the claims considered in their entirety and including all of their constituent limitations or to any characterization of a reference by the Examiner. Applicants have shown all pending claims to be allowable and respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

New Claim

Applicants add new Claim 48, which is fully supported by the specification of the present Application as originally filed. Claim 48 depends on Claim 1, which Applicants have shown to be allowable. *Satt* and *Rauhala*, alone and in combination, do not disclose, teach, or suggest the limitations of new Claim 48. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request consideration and allowance of new Claim 48.

CONCLUSION


Applicants have now made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for all other reasons clear and apparent, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge \$50.00 to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P. for an additional dependent claim. Please credit any overpayment, or charge any additional fee required by this paper, to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

If there are matters that can be discussed by telephone to advance prosecution of this application, Applicants invite the Examiner to contact its attorney, Barton E. Showalter, at (214) 953-6509.

Respectfully submitted,
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P.
Attorneys for Applicants

Barton E. Showalter
Reg. No. 38,302

A handwritten signature of Barton E. Showalter, consisting of two loops and a horizontal line.

Date: January 16, 2007

at Customer No. **05073**